

## Could Large CP Violation Be Detected at Colliders?

C. J.-C. Im, G. L. Kane, and P. J. Malde

*Randall Laboratory of Physics  
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109*

### Abstract

We argue that CP-violation effects below a few  $\times 10^{-3}$  are probably undetectable at hadron and electron colliders. Thus only operators whose contributions interfere with tree-level Standard Model amplitudes are detectable. We list these operators for Standard Model external particles and some two and three body final state reactions that could show detectable effects. These could test electroweak baryogenesis scenarios.

# 1 Introduction

Our understanding of the baryon asymmetry of the universe is at an exciting stage of development. Ideas that show promise for explaining the baryon asymmetry at the electroweak scale are being studied[1]. So far, all such approaches require large CP-violation, *i.e.*, CP-violating terms in the Lagrangian with coefficients of the same order as the gauge couplings.

If such terms exist, their presence may be directly detectable in collisions at the electroweak scale. The purpose of this paper is to emphasize several processes that can be studied at present and future colliders to search for large CP-violating effects, with emphasis on FNAL. While the possibility of relating such effects to the origin of the baryon asymmetry is particularly exciting, motivation for studying such processes is also provided by the simple observation that at the present time published limits do not exist for the size of most CP-violating processes at the 100 GeV scale. Thus heretofore undetected large( $\sim 50\%$ ) CP-violation could occur in some processes at high energy hadron colliders.

Existing electroweak baryogenesis scenarios often depend on CP-violating Higgs interactions such as  $ih\bar{t}\gamma_5 t$ . These are probably the most important vertices to study. Although the motivation for hypothesizing other vertices is less compelling, given the speculative nature of present electroweak baryogenesis scenarios we believe that a systematic study of all processes which could show a large CP-violation is appropriate.

We understand, of course, that none of the reactions we list will be easy to study, but we think it will eventually be possible to carry out such analyses. The implications of a positive result are large enough that the effort is justified.

We will parameterize the general CP-violation in terms of CP-violating operators of dimension less than or equal to six. Some of these vertices occur in various baryogenesis scenarios. In this paper, we confine our attention to those operators that involve only the Standard Model (SM) fields; perhaps eventually operators involving, for example, superpartners can be studied.

CP-violation parameters at low energies such as  $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon'$ , and  $d_n$ [2] generally place only weak constraints on higher dimensional CP-violating operators because some of these operators contain derivative couplings that provide a factor of  $\hat{s}$  that leads to suppression at low energies. At collider energies, however, these operators can be as large as the SM vertices. At the present time we have only made qualitative analyses of such constraints and checked that none of the processes we examine are excluded from occurring at significant levels; we will report a more careful and systematic analysis in the future.

## 2 CP Violation at Colliders

A number of analyses of possible CP-violation effects at colliders have been published [3–8]. Some have emphasized the possible role of the top quark[6–13]. There is, however, a major constraint that we feel has not been considered sufficiently. For both theoretical and experimental reasons, we think that it is probably impossible to detect CP-violation effects of order  $10^{-3}$  in collider experiments.

The first reason is that the detectors will not be CP-invariant. Systematic studies can be done to determine at what level asymmetries in electric or magnetic field lines, nonuniformity in acceptance efficiency, or spatial asymmetries in the detector could induce an apparent CP-asymmetry. Intuitively one might guess they could be of order  $10^{-3}$ . To argue they were smaller than that level would require careful studies of SM processes that are not sensitive to CP-violation effects. In this experimental “proof,” it will be necessary to get the errors on charge and parity dependent measurements of particular processes below 0.1%. This could be very difficult, since even the most abundant process that might allow such a measurement, probably single  $W$  production, will have statistical errors on any measurement even at the SSC that are of order  $10^{-3}$ . Whether systematic errors can be reduced to that level is not known. Furthermore, all analysis cuts and whatever processes are used to calibrate the detector must be shown to be CP-invariant at the relevant level.

The second reason is that it will probably be very difficult to isolate and eliminate spurious CP-violating effects from the SM processes at the  $10^{-3}$  level. Whenever one is studying CP-violation by actually studying “naive T”-violation and assuming CPT-invariance, one has to be sure that spurious “T”-violating effects such as final state interactions[9, 11] are not present. For example, gluon exchange induces an apparent parity-violating transverse polarization of order  $1\% \sim 2\%$  in  $t\bar{t}$  production[6]. This effect can be approximately calculated[6] and a correction made both theoretically and experimentally, but it will be difficult to eliminate a residual effect of order 0.2%. The process  $u\bar{d} \rightarrow t\bar{b}$  provides another example. For this reaction, one can search for CP-violation by studying  $u\bar{d} \rightarrow t\bar{b}$  and looking for “T”-violating observables formed from momenta and the top spin. Then final state QCD interactions and top width effects both induce such observables in the range 0.1–1%. Yet another example is the  $Wjj$ -channel, perhaps plus softer jets, that will be a background for  $t\bar{t}$ . Parton level processes in which quarks scatter by exchanging a gluon and one of the quarks radiates a  $W$  will interfere with processes in which the quarks scatter by exchanging a  $Z$  and one of the quarks or the  $Z$  radiates a  $W$ , generating an irreducible parity-violating component in the background; this can easily be of order 1%. Perhaps it can be reduced by an appropriate choice of bins and cuts. The difficulty is

that one must find all such effects and eliminate them before one could believe that there is a new source of CP-violation.

Furthermore, even when comparing CP conjugate reactions corrections must be made for structure function differences and backgrounds. These effects are partly measurable and calculable in SM, so they can be partly corrected for, but it would take a great deal of effort and confidence to believe in a new effect that was much below about a few tenths of a percent. In addition, any effects that depend on top spin may be affected by some hadronization of the top quark that polarizes or depolarizes the top quark spin.

Even if an observable that does not suffer from these effects could be constructed, it cannot signal CP-violation on event-by-event basis. Thus, in order to probe CP-violating effects at the  $10^{-3}$  level, it would require at least  $10^{6\sim 7}$  events of some particular type. This is already at the limit of capabilities of SSC/LHC.

Because of these arguments we conclude that it is probably impossible to establish new CP-violating effects of order  $10^{-3}$  at colliders. That is not much of a constraint on FNAL searches, where most channels will have statistical limits of the same order or larger, but it may limit searches at SSC/LHC where statistical effects might approach the  $10^{-3}$ — $10^{-4}$  level.

There is a qualitative difference in the physics one can study with  $10^{-2}$  effects and with  $10^{-3}$  effects. Since CP-violating effects always arise from interferences, and since all loops in the SM are already suppressed by factors of order  $10^{-3}$ , if  $10^{-3}$  is indeed a lower limit on what could be discovered, we conclude that *only new CP-violating effects that interfere with SM tree amplitudes could be detected at colliders.*

Given this conclusion, we can enumerate all processes in which new CP-violating effects could be observed. It can be shown that we only need to consider processes that involve at least one top quark or boson-boson couplings (such as gauge self-couplings or Higgs-gauge boson couplings). As a corollary, we find that even if there is a CP-violating effect in the process  $p\bar{p} \rightarrow Zg$ , it will be unobservable at collider experiments, contrary to a recent speculation[14]. This point will be elaborated elsewhere.

Some of the processes that exhibit tree-level CP-violation are shown in Table 1 and Table 2. Fortunately all interesting vertices in the SM are present, though very large luminosity would be required to study them all down to the  $10^{-3}$  level. In the second column of Table 1, we only show a typical hypothetical CP-violating diagram. These interfere with the CP-even contribution from the SM to yield tree-level CP-violation effects. Not all of the processes generated this way yield an observable in practice. In  $gg \rightarrow g \rightarrow t\bar{t}$  with a CP-violating  $ggg$ -vertex, for example, CP-violating effect vanishes upon averaging over initial gluon spins. In the third column we show CP-violating operators that correspond to the CP-odd diagrams. We have written

them in a transparent form, but in actual calculations we use operators that are fully gauge-invariant[5, 15, 16]. Thus,  $\partial_\nu$  really is the covariant derivative  $D_\nu = \partial_\nu - ig_2 W_\nu^a \tau^a/2 - ig_1 B_\nu/2 - ig_3 G_\nu^a \lambda^a/2$  which connects  $W\bar{t}b$  vertex to  $G\bar{t}t$  vertex, etc.

Since some of the CP-violating operators are dimension 6, they have an effective coefficient proportional to  $\Lambda^{-2}$ , where  $\Lambda$  is some mass scale characteristic of the new physics. Then the contribution to observables could have a factor of  $\hat{s}/\Lambda^2$ , and the effect will grow with energy. At  $e^+e^-$  colliders this will be a useful effect, but at hadron colliders the structure functions cut off such an enhancement.

### 3 Observables

In general, there are two ways to observe CP-violation in high energy processes[3–8]. One can compare CP-conjugate reactions, such as  $bW^+ \rightarrow th$  and  $\bar{b}W^- \rightarrow \bar{t}h$  at the appropriate angles. Then it is necessary that electric charges and certain kinematic quantities be measured. In most cases that will eventually be possible (see sec 3.4). Alternatively, assuming CPT-invariance, one can look for “T”-violating observables in a single process as long as we look for effects larger than the expected final state interaction (FSI). The sensitivity of this method can be sharpened somewhat by calculating the expected FSI.

In two body reactions one needs a spin as well as momenta to form CP-violating observables. For top-quark production processes, the simplest “T”-violating observable is  $\mathcal{O}_1 = \hat{\sigma}_t \cdot \hat{n}$ , where  $\hat{\sigma}_t$  and  $\hat{n}$  are the top-spin and the unit vector normal to the top production plane. The top-spin can be analyzed unambiguously by letting the top decay into a  $b$ -quark and a  $W$  and measuring their momenta, or even from the charged lepton from the  $W$  decay[17]. For a top production process  $ab \rightarrow tX$ , the corresponding CP-violating observable is  $\hat{\sigma}_t \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \vec{p}_a) + \hat{\sigma}_{\bar{t}} \cdot (\vec{p}_{\bar{t}} \times \vec{p}_{\bar{a}})$ . However, if the incoming  $a$  can be in either of the collider beams, then averaging over the two possible beam directions makes  $\mathcal{O}_1$  identically zero. In this case, one has to look for a more complicated “T”-violating observable that does not vanish upon averaging over the two possible directions of the incoming  $a$ . Finally, one must verify explicitly that the observable thus constructed yields a non-vanishing expectation value. We have followed this procedure in this paper.

To convert observables containing the top spin into observables containing the momenta of the decay products of the top, replace  $\hat{\sigma}^\mu$  in the observable defined in terms of the top spin by  $q_w^\mu - q_b^\mu(q_w \cdot q_b)/M_w^2$ . The momenta  $q_b$  and  $q_w$  are the momenta of the decay products of the top,  $p_t = q_w + q_b$ . Thus,  $\hat{\sigma} \cdot \hat{n} = \hat{\sigma} \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \vec{p})$  is equivalent to  $\vec{q}_w \cdot (\vec{q}_b \times \vec{p})$ , where  $p$  is the momentum of one of the incoming particles.

### 3.1 $bW^+ \rightarrow th$

Once top and a Higgs boson are discovered, one can imagine studying this important process. The Higgs boson will decay to  $b\bar{b}$  with  $M_{b\bar{b}} = M_h$ . There will be electroweak–QCD background with the same characteristics as signal events, but the background will not produce a CP–violating effect.

The simplest observable  $\hat{\sigma}_t \cdot (\vec{p}_b \times \vec{p}_t)$  works if we can identify event–by–event the direction of the incoming  $b$ –quark. This may be achievable in practice by exploiting the fact that the energy distribution of the incoming  $W$  in the proton beam is significantly lower than that of the incoming  $b$ –quark. Hence the direction of the center–of–mass momentum of the  $th$  system, which is along one of the beam directions, is highly correlated with the direction of the initial  $b$ –quark momentum. Thus the appropriate observable in this case is  $\vec{p}_h \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \hat{\sigma}_t)$ .

If  $\vec{p}_b$  is not identified event–by–event, the simplest observable is  $\vec{p}_t \cdot \vec{z} \vec{z} \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \hat{\sigma}_t)$ . Equivalently, in terms of the decay product momenta of the top–quark, the observable is  $\vec{p}_t \cdot \vec{z} \vec{z} \cdot (\vec{q}_b \times \vec{q}_w)$  (see Table 1). Since the charged lepton from  $t$  semileptonic decay goes preferentially in the direction of the top spin[17], one can replace  $\hat{\sigma}_t$  by  $\vec{p}_l$  in any observable. For  $\bar{t}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_{\bar{t}}$  should be replaced by  $-\vec{p}_l$ . With a parity–even phase space used in analysis, the SM predicts vanishing expectation values for these observables.

### 3.2 $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Zh$

The situation here is similar to that of  $bW^+ \rightarrow th$ . The  $h$  is only used to provide a direction, and is detected by selecting  $b\bar{b}$  with  $M_{b\bar{b}} = M_h$ . Background from production of  $Z + g(\rightarrow b\bar{b})$  will necessarily be present but will not produce a CP–violation effect. The analysis is similar to that for  $bW^+ \rightarrow th$ , with the  $Z$  polarization vector replacing the top spin direction, and in practice the  $Z$  polarization is analyzed by its decay into  $l^+l^-$  or into  $q\bar{q}$ [18].

For  $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Zh$  at FNAL, the initial  $q$  and  $\bar{q}$  carry approximately equal fractions of the beam momentum so that it is necessary to use observables independent of the directions of the incoming momenta as written in Table 1. At  $pp$  colliders the  $q$  will typically carry a larger fraction of momenta than the  $\bar{q}$ , thus there is a correlation between  $\vec{p}_q$  and the direction of the motion of the center–of–mass of  $Zh$  system. In this case, the simple observable  $(\vec{p}_Z + \vec{p}_h) \cdot (\vec{\epsilon}_Z \times \vec{p}_Z)$  can be used, with the momentum of one of the  $Z$  decay products replacing  $\vec{\epsilon}_Z$  in practice.

### 3.3 $gW^+ \rightarrow t\bar{b}$ , $u\bar{d} \rightarrow t\bar{b}$ , and $ud \rightarrow tb$

The situation here is analogous to  $th$  production. If an effect is ever found, it will be possible to untangle which process is involved by using top production rate and decay angular distribution information. The  $\bar{b}$  (or  $b$ ) provides a direction and possibly a way to discriminate between  $t\bar{b}$ ,  $\bar{t}b$ ,  $tb$  final states. The process  $ud \rightarrow tb$  is doubly CKM suppressed.

### 3.4 $q\bar{q} \rightarrow gq\bar{q}$ and $gg \rightarrow ggg$

Construction of an observable for  $g(p)g(\bar{p}) \rightarrow g(q_1)g(q_2)g(q_3)$  is complicated by the fact that the simplest observables, such as the triple vector product, are antisymmetric in its momenta and the cross section is symmetric. For this process, any observable that depends on ordering of jets (according to their energies, etc.) will have exactly vanishing expectation value. This contrasts with the cases considered by Donoghue and Valencia[3]. By trial and error, one finds that the simplest observable that is symmetric in  $p$  and  $\bar{p}$  and in  $q_1$ ,  $q_2$ , and  $q_3$  is  $\mathcal{O}_g = \hat{z} \cdot (\vec{q}_1 \times \vec{q}_2) \hat{z} \cdot (\vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2) \hat{z} \cdot (\vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_3) \hat{z} \cdot (\vec{q}_2 - \vec{q}_3)$ , where  $\hat{z}$  is a unit vector along one of the beam directions.

The ALEPH group[19] has published results implying that the electric charge of energetic jets can be measured by performing an appropriately weighted sum over particles in the jet, using techniques based on earlier studies of the JADE[20] and MAC[21] groups. There appears to be no reason[22] why these techniques could not be used at hadron colliders. Assuming they can be used, to study  $q\bar{q} \rightarrow gq\bar{q}$  one should select events with three jets with one jet having positive electric charge, one negative, and one zero, summing over all quark types. This should ensure a sample mainly from  $u\bar{u} \rightarrow gq\bar{q}$  and  $d\bar{d} \rightarrow gq\bar{q}$ , separating them from  $u\bar{d}$  or  $uu$  initiated events. At SSC/LHC, the events to consider are  $uu \rightarrow gqq$  and  $dd \rightarrow gqq$ , so that one would select events with two like-sign and one neutral jet. In this case the simplest observable is  $(\vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z}(\vec{q}_1 \times \vec{q}_2) \cdot \hat{z}$ , where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are the momenta of the jets from the  $q\bar{q}$  pair and  $\hat{z}$  is along one of the beam directions.

Gluons radiated off quarks will not induce any apparent large CP-violating effect, but will dilute any real effect, so they should be suppressed by cutting out events where the neutral jet is near the beam direction or either of the final quarks. Final state interactions will cause effects of order  $\alpha_s/\pi$ , so only a signal larger than this could be trusted (see sec. 2). On the other hand, too large an effect here would induce a neutron electric dipole moment. We estimate that there is room between these constraints to look for an effect of order 0.1.

## 4 Summary

As discussed in the introduction, there is good motivation to look for new, large CP-violation effects at the electroweak scale. Because it is crucial to demonstrate experimentally that spurious CP-violation from detector and electroweak-QCD effects (examples are given in section 2) are absent at the level of any claimed effect, We have argued that CP-violating effects of order  $10^{-3}$  are probably unobservable at colliders.

Given this conclusion, it is only possible to observe a new, CP-violating contribution that interferes with a SM tree level process; any SM loop correction is already too small to be observable at colliders. Then only a small number of such processes could be detected. We have listed most processes with external SM particles that could show such effects, and described how to analyze data to search for them.

In the future we will report similar analyses for external supersymmetric partners and perhaps other non-SM particles. We hope that eventually either such large CP-violating effects can be detected, or that limits can be obtained that are relevant to understanding baryogenesis at the electroweak scale.

## 5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

C. I. thanks the theory groups at the Fermi Laboratory, the Brookhaven Laboratory, and Seoul National University, Korea, for kind hospitality. C. I. also thanks C. P. Yuan and Tao Han for their help. G. K. appreciates conversations with A. Dolgov, M. Voloshin, and particularly with D. Amidei. Both C. I. and G. K. acknowledge valuable conversations with J.-M. Frère. This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy.



## 6 Table 1

In Table 1 we list several two body processes that can be tested at hadron colliders to detect large CP-violation. For each process we show one of several diagrams that contribute, where a solid-circle stands for the CP-violating vertex; these interfere with the tree-level SM amplitudes of the same form. The next column gives one of the CP-violating operators that contribute to the process, and the final column lists ways to observe the effect. In all cases,  $\hat{\sigma}_t$  is the top-quark spin,  $\hat{z}$  is one of the beam directions,  $\vec{p}_t(\vec{p}_Z)$  is the momentum of the top-quark ( $Z$ ), and  $\vec{q}_+$  is the momentum of the positively charged decay product of the  $Z$  in  $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z^0 h$ . There are two possible choices for  $\hat{z}$ , but the observables are independent of this choice. Finally,  $N_+$  ( $N_-$ ) refers to the number of positively charged decay product of either  $Z$  or top-quark emerging above (below) the  $x$ - $z$  plane, where the coordinate system is defined so that  $\hat{z}$  is the beam momentum making an acute angle with  $\vec{p}_t$ , and  $\vec{p}_t$  lies in the first quadrant of the  $x$ - $z$  plane.  $\hat{y} = \hat{z} \times \hat{x}$ . The coefficient  $\Delta$ 's measure the strengths of the CP-violating operators. Note that  $\Delta_{Wt}$ ,  $\Delta_{Zh}$ , and  $\Delta_{gt}$  have dimensions of  $M^{-2}$ , while  $\Delta_{ht}$  is dimensionless.

| Reaction                        | Example | CP Operator                                                               | Observables                                                                            |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| $u\bar{d} \rightarrow t\bar{b}$ |         | $i\Delta_{Wt}W_{\mu\nu}^+\bar{t}_L\gamma^\mu\partial^\nu b_L$             | $\vec{p}_t \cdot \hat{z}\hat{\sigma}_t \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \hat{z})$ , $N_+ - N_-$ |
| $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z^0 h$    |         | $\Delta_{Zh}h\epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\eta}\tilde{Z}_{\mu\nu}Z_{\sigma\eta}$ | $\vec{p}_Z \cdot \hat{z}\vec{q}_+ \cdot (\vec{p}_Z \times \hat{z})$ , $N_+ - N_-$      |
| $gW^+ \rightarrow t\bar{b}$     |         | $i\Delta_{gt}G_{\mu\nu}^a\bar{t}\gamma^\mu\lambda^a\partial^\nu t$        | $\vec{p}_t \cdot \hat{z}\hat{\sigma}_t \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \hat{z})$ , $N_+ - N_-$ |
| $bW^+ \rightarrow th$           |         | $i\Delta_{ht}h\bar{t}\gamma_5 t$                                          | $\vec{p}_t \cdot \hat{z}\hat{\sigma}_t \cdot (\vec{p}_t \times \hat{z})$ , $N_+ - N_-$ |

## 7 Table 2

In Table 2 we list some of the three body processes that can be tested at FNAL to detect large CP-violation. The entries are defined as in Table 1. In all cases,  $p_i$ 's ( $q_i$ 's) are the incoming (outgoing) momenta. If the charges of parent partons of jets can be identified (see text for details), we use the sign of their charges as subscripts of the corresponding momenta. Hence,  $\vec{q}_0$  is the momentum of a gluon jet,  $\vec{q}_+$  the momentum of a  $u$ ,  $\bar{d}$  or  $\bar{s}$ , etc. For  $gg \rightarrow ggg$ , the observable  $\mathcal{O}_g$ , defined in sec. 3.4, is totally symmetric in the  $q_j$ 's and in the  $p_i$ 's. This observable can also be used for  $qq \rightarrow qqg$ . The simplest observable for  $qq \rightarrow qqg$  is symmetric in the two momenta of the jets coming from the charged quark pairs. Hence, in practice, one only needs to isolate the neutral jet. The vector  $\hat{z}$  is along one of the beam directions.

| Reaction             | Example | CP Operator                                                                                 | Observables                                                                        |
|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| $gg \rightarrow ggg$ |         | $\Delta_g f_{abc} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\eta} G_\mu^{a\rho} G_{\rho\nu}^b G_{\sigma\eta}^c$ | $\mathcal{O}_g$                                                                    |
| $qq \rightarrow qqg$ |         | $\Delta_g f_{abc} \epsilon^{\mu\nu\sigma\eta} G_\mu^{a\rho} G_{\rho\nu}^b G_{\sigma\eta}^c$ | $(\vec{q}_+ - \vec{q}_-) \cdot \hat{z} (\vec{q}_+ \times \vec{q}_-) \cdot \hat{z}$ |

## References

- [1] L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62** (1989) 1075  
A. G. Cohen, D. B. Kaplan, and A. E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 561  
N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 2331; Nucl. Phys. **B358** (1991) 471  
L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov, N. Turok, and M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. **B256** (1991) 451  
M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton, Jr., and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. **B257** (1991) 351  
R. J. Scherrer, J. Cline, S. Raby, and D. Seckel, Phys. Rev. **D44** (1991) 3760  
A.G. Cohen and A.E. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **B297** (1992) 111  
A.D. Dolgov, Phys. Rep. **222** (1992) 309  
R. N. Mohapatra and X. Zhang, “Electroweak Baryogenesis in Left–Right Symmetric Models,” UMDHEP–92–230
- [2] K. Smith *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B234** (1990) 191  
I. Altarev *et al.*, Pis’ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **44** (1986) 360 [JETP Lett. **44** (1986) 460]  
S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63** (1989) 2333; Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 860  
J. Dai, H. Dykstra, R. Leigh, S. Paban, and D. Dicus, Phys. Lett. **B237** (1990) 216; Erratum, *Ibid.*, **B242** (1990) 547
- [3] J. F. Donoghue and G. Valencia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 451
- [4] R. Barbieri, Z. Phys. **C32** (1986) 437  
W. Bernreuther and O. Nachtmann, Phys. Lett. **B268** (1991) 424  
A. Brandenburg, J. P. Ma, R. Münch, and O. Nachtmann, Z. Phys. **C51** (1991) 225  
J. Körner, J. P. Ma, R. Münch, O. Nachtmann, and R. Schöpf, Z. Phys. **C49** (1991) 447  
M. Nowakowski and A. Pilaftsis, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A6** (1991) 1933  
W. Bernreuther, T. Schröder, and T. N. Pham, Phys. Lett. **B279** (1992) 389  
W. Bernreuther, T. Schröder, and T. N. Phan, Phys. Lett. **B279** (1992) 389  
W. Bernreuther, O. Nachtmann, P. Overmann, and T. Schröder, Heidelberg University Preprint, HD–THEP–92–14, 1992  
J. Ma and A. Brandenburg, Z. Phys. **C56** (1992) 97
- [5] C. P. Burgess and J. A. Robinson, “Effective Lagrangian and CP Violation from New Physics,” McGill University Preprint, MCGILL–90–28, 1990

- [6] G. L. Kane, G. Ladinsky, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 124
- [7] C. R. Schmidt and M. E. Peskin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69** (1992) 410
- [8] B. Grzadkowski and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Lett. **B294** (1992) 361
- [9] J. Liu, “Final-State-Interaction Simulation of T-Violation in Top Quark Semileptonic Decay,” University of Pennsylvania Preprint, UPR-0517T, 1992
- [10] C. R. Schmidt, “A Top Quark CP-violating Asymmetry in Supersymmetric Models,” SLAC-PUB-5878
- [11] G. Eilam, J. L. Hewett, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67** (1991) 1979
- [12] B. Grzadkowski and J. F. Gunion, Phys. Lett. **B287** (1992) 237
- [13] R. Cruz, B. Grzadkowski, J. F. Gunion, Phys. Lett. **B289** (1992) 440
- [14] A. Brandenburg, J.P. Ma, and O. Nachtmann, Z. Phys. **C55** (1992) 115
- [15] A. De Rujula, M. B. Gavela, O. Pene, and F. J. Vegas, Phys. Lett. **B245** (1990) 640; Nucl. Phys. **B357** (1991) 311
- [16] M. B. Einhorn and J. Wudka, International Workshop on Electroweak Symmetry Breaking, W. A. Bardeen *et al.*, ed., Hiroshima, 1991
- [17] G. L. Kane, Lectures at the 1984 SLAC Summer Institute, E. C. Brennan, ed., Stanford, 1985
- [18] S. Y. Choi, Taeyeon Lee, and H.S. Song, Phys. Rev. **D40** (1989) 2477
- [19] ALEPH Collaboration, D. Stuart *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 983
- [20] JADE Collaboration, T. Greenshaw *et al.*, Z. Phys. **C42** (1989) 1
- [21] MAC Collaboration, W. Ash *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58** (1987) 1080
- [22] G. K. appreciates discussions with A. Blondel on these questions.